UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

BEIJING AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY IMPORT AND)	
EXPORT CORPORATION,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	1:13-cv-01850-JMS-DML
VS.)	
)	
Indian Industries, Inc. d/b/a Escalade)	
SPORTS and DOES 1-50,)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

On November 21, 2013, Plaintiff Beijing Automotive Industry Import and Export Corporation ("Beijing") filed a Complaint against Defendants Indian Industries, Inc. d/b/a Escalade Sports ("Escalade") and Does 1-50. [Dkt. 1.] In the Complaint, Beijing states that this Court has diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because it is "a Chinese corporation with its principal of business in Beijing, China," Escalade is "an Indiana corporation with its principal place of business in Evansville, Indiana," and "the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00, exclusive of costs or interest." [Id. at 1-2, ¶¶ 1-3.]

The Court must independently determine whether proper diversity among the parties exists. *Thomas v. Guardsmark, LLC*, 487 F.3d 531, 533 (7th Cir. 2007). Having reviewed Beijing's Complaint, the Court cannot assure itself that it can exercise diversity jurisdiction over this matter. Beijing's allegation that it is "a Chinese corporation with its principal place of business in Beijing, China" does not inform the Court which American business form Beijing most closely resembles. The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals has said such information is required to adequately address whether diversity jurisdiction exists. *See Global Dairy Solutions Pty Ltd. v. BouMatic LLC*, 2013 WL 1767964, at *1 n.1 (7th Cir. 2013) (analyzing the citizenship of the

foreign corporation based on which American business form the foreign company most closely

resembles) (citing White Pearl Invesiones S.A. (Uruguay) v. Cemusa, Inc., 647 F.3d 684 (7th Cir.

2011)). Therefore, Beijing must amend its Complaint to properly allege its citizenship in con-

formity with Global Dairy and White Pearl.

For this reason, the Court ORDERS Beijing to file an amended complaint that

properly pleads diversity jurisdiction by <u>December 20, 2013</u>. Escalade need not answer the

Complaint, [dkt. 1], but shall answer or otherwise respond to any amended complaint with-

in the time period prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

12/10/2013

Hon. Jane Magnus-Stinson, Judge United States District Court

Southern District of Indiana

Distribution via ECF only:

Tabitha Jane Balzer LEWIS & KAPPES tbalzer@lewis-kappes.com

Thomas R. Ruge LEWIS & KAPPES truge@lewis-kappes.com